CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	✓ Force	✓ Discourt.	U.S.
Rolando Vasquez		Squad #13	201806615	✓ Abuse	O.L.	☐ Injury
Incident Date(s)	Location of Incident:		•	Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Friday, 08/10/2018 5:00 PM		Sutter Avenue and Rockaway Avenue 73		73	2/10/2020	2/10/2020
Date/Time CV Reported	CV Reported At: How CV Reported: Date/Time Received at CCRB		RB			
Fri, 08/10/2018 6:24 PM		CCRB On-line website Fri, 08/10/2018 6:24 PM				
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addre	ess			
Witness(es)		Home Addre	ess			
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. POM Christian Calvagna	03153	964956	075 PCT			
2. Officers			PBBN			
Witness Officer(s)	Shield N	o Tax No	Cmd Name			
1. DTS Kaz Daughtry	3581	940052	PBBN			
Officer(s)	Allegatio	on		Inv	estigator Recon	nmendation
A.POM Christian Calvagna	Force: PO Christian Calvagna pointed his gun at § 87(2)(b)					
C.POM Christian Calvagna	Abuse: PO Christian Calvagna stopped the vehicle in which was an occupant.					
D.POM Christian Calvagna	Discourtesy: PO Christian Calvagna spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)					
E. Officers	Abuse: Officers refused to provide their names and shield numbers to §87(2)(b)					

Case Summary

On August 10, 2018, § 87(2)(b)	filed this complaint with the	CCRB online.
On August 10, 2018, \$87(2)(b) was	alone in his car parked on Su	ıtter Avenue near
Rockaway Avenue, in Brooklyn. §87(2)(b)	s wife, § 87(2)(b) W	alked out to the car to
meet him, and he handed her some cash and ar	ID card through the passeng	ger side window. At
this time, PO Christian Calvagna, of the 75th Pa	recinct, ran up to § 87(2)(b)	with his gun drawn
and pointed at him (Allegation A – Force: \$870	and shouted "F	reeze, put your
fucking hands up." (Allegation B – Abuse of	Authority: § 87(2)(9)	(Allegation C –
Discourtesy: § 87(2)(9) Two additional un	identified officers approache	ed the area.
asked what was going on, and one of the	he unidentified officers told l	him that there had
been a call of a shooting involving a car that m	natched his car's description.	§ 87(2)(b) asked the
officers for their names and badge numbers, ar	nd they did not respond (Alle	gation D – Abuse of
Authority: § 87(2)(9)). The offic	ers apologized for stopping §	87(2)(b) and then
they left.	_	<u>.</u>

There was no video footage available for this incident.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Force: PO Christian Calvagna pointed his gun at § 87(2)(b) Allegation (B): Abuse of Authority: PO Christian Calvagna stopped the vehicle in which was an occupant. Allegation (C): Discourtesy: PO Christian Calvagna spoke discourteously to \$37(2)(5) (Board Review 01) stated that he pulled up to the curb at the location so that he could drop off some cash to \$37(2)(b) along with her identification. \$37(2)(b) walked up handed her the items through the passenger side window. At that time, saw PO Calvagna running up to him from across the street with his gun drawn and pointed at him. He said to \$87(2)(b) "Freeze, put your fucking hands up." \$87(2)(b) complied. After other officers came up to them, PO Calvagna put his gun away and left. Some of the other officers later told § 87(2)(b) that there had been a robbery reported recently involving a car that matched his car's description. s testimony (Board Review 02) was consistent with \$87(2)(b) s with two exceptions: she did not state that PO Calvagna used discourtesy, but rather that he said, "Put your hands up, don't move," and she also described PO Calvagna, who is a white male, as a black male. PO Calvagna (Board Review 03) stated that he saw §87(2)(b) seated in his car handing what appeared to be cash and a plastic bag. This appeared to PO Calvagna to be a hand to hand drug transaction, and decided to approach [87(2)[5] to investigate it. Because the crime he suspected was a felony, PO Calvagna feared for his safety and decided to draw his firearm as he ordered him to stop and keep his hands visible. He could not recall whether he pointed his firearm at § 87(2)(b) There had also been a shot-spotter report over the radio a short time before the incident, which influenced his decision to draw his firearm; however, PO Calvagna could not describe any further details of the shot-spotter incident. Nothing else contributed to his decision to approach \$87(2)(b) with his gun drawn or his suspicion that a drug transaction was occurring. He denied that he directed any profanity at § 87(2)(b)

Page 2

Det. Kaz Daughtry of Patrol Borough Brooklyn North was identified as PO Calvagna's partner during the incident. Det. Daughtry testified that he did not recall whether he had worked with PO Calvagna prior to the incident date or if this was their first time working together (Board Review 11). While stopped at a red light, Det. Daughtry saw who was standing near a white vehicle, hand money to \$57(2)(0) who was seated inside the vehicle. Det. Daughtry made no additional observations. PO Calvagna immediately told Det. Daughtry that he saw a hand-to-hand drug transaction in which \$57(2)(0) handed currency to \$57(2)(0) and \$57(2)(0) handed currency to
§ 87(2)(g)
According to the event summary related to the incident, there were two shot-spotter incidents occurring prior to the incident with the general vicinity: one took place ten blocks away from the incident, fifteen minutes prior to the stop, and was closed out five minutes prior to the stop when an officer reported over the radio that there had been no shots, but rather a truck had backfired (Board Review 16); a second shot spotter occurred eight minutes prior to the stop, eighteen blocks away from the incident, and was closed five minutes later when an officer requested that no further units respond to the incident (Board Review 17). Neither call describes any suspect, direction of flight, or confirms that any crime had occurred.

While Det. Daughtry did not see PO Calvagna point his gun at \$37(2)(b) he noted that PO Calvagna had his gun drawn and that \$37(2)(b) was upset that a gun had been pointed at him. Even though PO Calvagna could not recall whether or not he did so, the preponderance of the evidence shows that he did, in fact, point his firearm at during the incident.

Information received from a shot-spotter incident is not only unverified, it is automated and anonymous. It does not identify the source of the gun shot sound, or even verify that it was

Page 3

caused by a gun shot. In this case, there was no description of suspects associated with the shot spotter incident.

In <u>People v. Rangle</u>, the court determined that an anonymous 911 call, which even described a specific suspect believed to be in possession of a firearm, was insufficient to justify a reasonable suspicion of a crime (<u>People v. Rangle</u> 298 A.D.2d 139 [2002]) (Board Review 18).

In <u>People v. Loper</u>, the Court determined that the exchange of small objects for currency does not in itself constitute reasonable suspicion that a drug transaction has occurred, and must be coupled with other factors including the experience of the observing officer, as well as prior knowledge of the location as drug prone (<u>People v. Loper</u>, 115 A.D.3d 875 [2014]) (Board Review 04).

None of these additional factors were present in this case, as PO Calvagna, who was still in training at the time of the incident and had less than one year in the NYPD, stated that the observation of passing money and a small object to through his car window was the sole reason for his suspicion of drug activity. Det. Daughtry's testimony did not note any additional observations which would have indicated that a drug transaction was occurring. Therefore, the investigation determined that PO Calvagna did not have reasonable suspicion that \$87(2)(6) was engaged in a drug transaction.

Although in <u>People v. Barrett</u> the court determined that, when possessing reasonable suspicion that a drug transaction is occurring, officers may approach individuals with their guns drawn and pointed to affect a stop, this justification does not apply in this case as PO Calvagna had no reasonable suspicion to that a crime was afoot. (<u>People v. Barrett</u>, 14 A.D.3d 369 [2005]) (Board Review 05).

Under the provisions of <u>Patrol Guide Procedure</u> 221.01 (Board Review 06), officers should only draw and display their firearms based on an articulable belief that the potential for serious physical injury is present, and should holster their firearms as soon as they determine that the potential for serious injury is no longer present.

§ 87(2)(g)
Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Officers refused to provide their names and shield
numbers to § 87(2)(b)
said that an unmarked vehicle arrived at the scene after PO Calvagna
approached him, and two officers got out. The officers spoke briefly with \$87(2)(b) and and
asked them their names and badge numbers. The officers did not respond, and got back
in their car and left.
The investigation was unable to identify these officers. There are several reasons for this.
There was no Event for the incident to identify units that responded (Board Review 07).
s description of these officers was vague and general; he described one as a black male of
Page 4

average size and build, and a white male of average height and build. Solution described a vehicle; however, no vehicle of that description was listed on vehicle assignment sheets or roll calls of the relevant commands on the date of the incident (Board Review 08). There were more than twenty officers matching the description of the subject officers, any one of whom could have been the subject officer (Board Review 9) (Board Review 10).

PO Calvagna testified that two other officers arrived during the incident, but he did not know who they were. Det. Daughtry testified that he did not remember if any other officers arrived during this incident.

Cirilian and Officer CCDD Historian							
Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories							
3 -1 (-)(-)							
 This is the first CCRB case in which PO Calvagna has been named as a subject. He has been a member of service for one year (Board Review 13). 							
	Mediation, (Civil and Criminal Histories					
 Mediation 	on was offered to § 87(2)(b)						
		incident has been filed with the New	York City				
		3, 2019, (Board Review 14).					
§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(c) (impair contract awards or CBAs)							
Squad No.:							
T							
Investigator: _	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date				
	Signature	Time Time & Name	Date				
Squad Leader: _							
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date				
Reviewer:							
	Signature	Print Title & Name	Date				
	U						

Page 5